



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,336	04/07/2006	Hironori Kobayashi	4700.P0326US	1816
23474 7590 06/02/2009 FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 RAMBLING ROAD KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631				
EXAMINER				
DOLLINGER, MICHAEL M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 20 May 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant responds to Examiner's arguments and argues that:

(1) It is well known in the art that the term "resin composition" is different from the components that make up the resin compositions and that the components that react to form a compound are not the same as the compound per se. Examiner disagrees; Examiner takes the position that the term "resin composition" has no patentable weight except implying that the composition is a resin, contains a resin, is capable of forming a resin or is prepared from a resin. It does not imply that the components that make up the resin composition are physically combined and unreacted, as Applicant seems to be implying. Applicant also argues that the currently presented language of claim 1 precludes the addition of a silane coupling agent to a polyurethane product. This is not true; the currently presented claim language merely requires a composition that comprises a polyol, a polyisocyanate and a silane coupling agent with an imidazole group. A polyurethane product comprises a polyol and a polyisocyanate inherently. Applicant also argues that since Kumagai et al only discloses the imidazole/organic monocarboxylic acid salt derivative reaction product as an additive

to a non-epoxy resin and not as a component of the resin, that Examiner's reading of Kumagai et al is in error. Examiner disagrees. Applicant is reading additional limitations on the terms "resin component" and "resin additive". Applicant seems to be implying that since Kumagai et al disclose the inventive compound as a "resin additive", that this is only a disclosure of an additive to a fully formed resin and not to what Applicant is implying is a "resin composition". However, a "resin additive" may be added at any point in the reaction process.

(2) Applicant also argues that the entire disclosure of Kumagai et al indicates that the "resin" disclosed therein is an epoxy resin. This is not true as Examiner has already pointed to the relevant passage that indicates various appropriate resins including a polyurethane [column 5 line 53 through column 6 line 7]. Applicant also argues that column 1 lines 20-24 state that there is ... for improving the adhesive strength and mechanical strength of a resin such as an epoxy resin, and a resin composition". Applicant's quotation is incomplete, Kumagai et al continue to disclose that the resin composition is in particular a polyimide resin composition. Applicant also argues that all of the examples in the reference disclose the use of epoxy resins only. This is not true because

Application as a Resin Additive (3) [column 9 lines 13-31] discloses the additive in a polyimide resin composition.

(3) Applicant also argues that the resin composition of the invention containing a silane coupling agent containing an imidazole group has unexpectedly better adhesion to a base material than the resin composition containing traditional silane coupling agents. Applicant argues that this improvement is completely unexpected by the prior art cited by the examiner. This is not true. The imidazole compounds of Kumagai et al are added specifically to improve adhesion of a resin [column 9 lines 13-14 and 56-60].

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL DOLLINGER whose telephone number is (571)270-5464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Randy Gulakowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

MICHAEL DOLLINGER
Examiner
Art Unit 1796

/mmd/